

  
**CITY OF CLAREMONT**  
**Historic District Commission Meeting**  
Thursday, October 6, 2016 7:00 PM  
City Hall, Council Chambers

**MINUTES**  
**Approved 10/27/2016**

**I. Roll Call**

**Members Present:** David Messier, Kristin Kenniston, Scott Pope, Richard Wahrlich

**Absent:**

**II. Review of Minutes from August 25, 2016**

**Corrections:** None

**Motion:** To approve the minutes of the August 25, 2016 meeting as written

**Made by:** Mrs. Kenniston      **Second:** Mr. Pope

**Vote:** Unanimous in favor

**III. Old Business**

There was no old business.

**IV. New Business**

- A. **HDC 2016-00010 Guido Boldini, Claremont** – for exterior renovations to the building at **170 Main Street**. Tax map 107, lot 48. Zone: MU.

Mr. Messier read the public notice and invited Mr. Boldini to present his application to the Commission.

Mr. Boldini said he is working for the owner of the property, Twin State Property Management, in the renovation of a portion of the building to accommodate a hair salon. While working on the interior, he has uncovered the framing for the original windows and would like to restore them and the original framing, both on the street-facing side of the building and the side facing the parking area. He also proposed adding a deck on the parking-lot side. The deck would cover a gully that runs along that side of the building, between the building and the parking lot. The gully can't be filled in because of the basement windows that are below grade and because of the meter socket for Eversource. The deck would be 64 ft x 12 ft - the length of the building, made of pressure-treated framing and Trex decking.

He would like to put a small awning roof over part of the deck as well. It will provide some shade to the windows on that side of the building and would improve the appearance of the building. The awning would be a structural shed-type roof, 2 ft to 3 ft wide, with cedar shakes on top and possible bead-board ceiling.

The windows on the parking lot side are 3 ft x 6 ft with a center divider and fixed glass.

Concrete bollards will be added to the parking lot to prevent access to the rear of the building.

He would like to remove the shed in the back of the building and replace it with a smaller structure to cover the ramp to the basement.

There were no questions from the Commission. There was no one from the public in the audience, so Mr. Messier opened and closed the public hearing. The Commission turned to reviewing their criteria.

Mrs. Kenniston read the Architectural Inventory sheet for this address. Mr. Messier pointed out that the building under review is actually an attachment to the historic building on the Inventory. (The addition housed the former Home Town Deli.) The Commission agreed to assign a rating of zero to the building as it does not contribute to the historic building.

HDC Criteria	
1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?	The portion of the building that is being renovated has no historical, architectural, or cultural value, but the building to which the addition is attached has historic and architectural value.
2. Are the proposed exterior design, arrangement, textures, and materials compatible with the existing buildings or structures and to the setting and surrounding uses?	Proposed work on the addition will complement the brick building; when finished, it will look more appropriate than it does now.
3. Are the scale and size of the proposed improvements compatible with the existing surroundings? (including height, width, street frontage, number of stories, roof type, façade openings such as windows, doors, etc., and architectural details)	This is a restoration project, not new construction, that will bring the windows back to their original scale.
4. How will the proposed improvements (signs, lights, yards, off-street parking, screening, fencing, entrance drive, sidewalks, and landscaping) affect the character of any building or structure within the district?	The end result of the proposed work will be a definite improvement; it will enhance the look of the building and have a positive effect in the neighborhood.
5. What impact will the proposal have on the setting? To what extent will the proposal help to preserve and enhance the historic, architectural, and cultural qualities of the district and the community?	This project will have a positive impact – the building is currently derelict; the proposed project may motivate others in the neighborhood to fix up their buildings as well
6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation?	This criterion is not applicable as the work is not being done on an historic building

**Motion: To approve:**

- The deck, the full length of the building, approximately 12 ft wide with pressure-treated frame and Trex decking;
- A structural awning, up to 3 feet wide, partially covering the deck the length of the building on the parking lot side, a few feet out from the building with cedar roofing and possible bead-board ceiling;
- Opening the original window size on the street façade
- Restoration of four windows on the parking lot side mimicking the original size and placement
- Removal of the shed off the rear of the building
- Placement of concrete bollards on the south side of the parking lot.

**Made by:** Mr. Pope    **Second:** Mr. Wahrlich

**Vote:** Unanimous in favor

**Motion:** To continue this hearing to the December 2nd meeting to review proposals for signage, siding and a replacement shed in the rear of the building.

**Made by:** Mrs. Kenniston      **Second:** Mr. Wahrlich

**Vote:** Unanimous in favor

**V. Other**

There was no other business.

**VI. Correspondence**

There was no correspondence.

**VII. Adjournment**

**Motion:** To adjourn the meeting

**Made by:** Mr. Pope      **Second:** Mrs. Kenniston

**Vote:** Unanimous in favor

Meeting adjourned at 7:38 PM.

**Respectfully submitted by,**

*de Forest Bearse*